

THE FRANKLIN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD THEIR REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH 27TH, 2007 AT 6:00 P.M., IN THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING ROOM IN THE COUNTY COURTHOUSE.

THERE WERE PRESENT: Wayne Angell, Chairman
 Charles Wagner, Vice-Chairman
 Leland Mitchell
 David Hurt
 Charles Poindexter
 Russ Johnson
 Hubert Quinn

OTHERS PRESENT: Richard E. Huff, II, County Administrator
 Christopher L. Whitlow, Asst. County Administrator
 B. J. Jefferson, County Attorney
 Sharon K. Tudor, CMC, Clerk

Chairman Wayne Angell called the meeting to order.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Kathleen Tulley, Union Hall District, asked the Board what happened to the buffer at Booker T. Washington Monument previously approved by the Board Mrs. Tulley, stated hundreds of citizens sat in this room and wondered where the trees went on the trail after the buffer was adopted. Mrs. Tulley asked if anyone was aware of this surprise, how does something like this happen, and what is the process for the County to take against the developer when something like this happens.

Chairman Angell advised Mrs. Tulley staff would look into the concern and forward a response.

BID AWARD FOR COMMERCE CENTER UTILITIES

Larry Moore, Assistant County Administrator, presented this request. The Commerce Center water and sewer system was required when the County landed a new industry called McAirloads. This industry will require a waste water sewer plant for their domestic use, and a water treatment plant upgrade for their fire suppressant system. Due to the low usage, the waste water treatment was changed from a direct discharge plant to a subsurface disposal plant. Although this package station will require maintenance, it will be less than the original 20,000 gpd direct discharge that the plant would have required since there was not enough flow to sustain the original direct discharge plant. Due to the fire suppressant requirements, a new well (well # 6) was dug and will be brought on line; which requires treatment. In addition to the water plant required for treatment, the water tank will need to be kept full for the fire suppressant system, so a chlorine circulating pump will also need to be added to the water storage tank.

The County advertisements requesting bids where advertised in Sunday, January 28th Roanoke Times and Friday, January 26th as well as in Monday, January 29th Franklin News Post. Unfortunately, the result was only one bid and it came in higher than anticipated. After a discussion with the single bidder about why the costs were so high, changes were made to the plans and the contract was re-advertised in Sunday, March 4th Roanoke Times and Friday, March 2nd in the Franklin News Post. This time, the advertisement was broken down into components for two bids and two additives. This was done as an attempt to obtain more competitive bidders. The strategy was effective and three bids were received.

After review of the bids, staff recommends Falwell Corporation for the Water Treatment System (Bid #1) and the Well # 6 Development (Additive #2) in the amount of \$614,708.00 and Steve Martin Trenching for the Wastewater Treatment Plant (Bid # 2) and the McAirload's Water Connection (Additive #1) in the amount of \$315,800.00. Falwell Corporation has done much work in the County and staff is very familiar with their work. (Some recent Falwell Corporation work includes digging Well # 6 in Commerce Center, the two wells for Windy Gap Elementary School, Lakewatch Plantation water lines and bio-wheels, and Bridgewater Point water and bio-wheel.) Steve Martin Trenching was also the contractor for the Forrest Hills project and the original contractor for the Commerce Center.

			Anderson Construction	Falwell Corporation	Steve Martin's Trenching	
--	--	--	--------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------------	--

ITEM #	ITEM	QUANTITY	UNITS	Lump Sum Price	Lump Sum Price	Lump Sum Price	Lump Sum Price
	Division I Water Treatment System						
1	Mobilization (3%)	1	LS	\$21,129.00	\$17,087.00	\$15,000.00	
2	Tank Recirculation & Rechlorination	1	LS	\$27,500.00	\$28,255.00	\$26,000.00	
3	Sitework	1	LS	\$260,200.00	\$98,416.00	\$71,800.00	
4	Water Treatment System	1	LS	\$165,800.00	\$157,935.00	\$265,000.00	
5	Treatment Building	1	LS	\$89,750.00	\$85,450.00	\$102,350.00	
6	Treatment Plant & Well Electrical	1	LS	\$63,916.00	\$69,000.00	\$100,000.00	
7	Telemetry & Control System	1	LS	\$89,635.00	\$123,035.00	\$121,827.00	
8	Laboratory and Safety Equipment (Allowance)	1	LS	\$7,500.00	\$7,500.00	\$7,500.00	
	Total Division I Base Bid			\$725,430.00	\$586,678.00	\$709,477.00	\$0.00
	Division II WastewaterTreatment Plant						
1	Mobilization (3%)	1	LS	\$12,435.00	\$11,512.00	\$8,000.00	
2	Sitework	1	LS	\$222,500.00	\$97,980.00	\$77,300.00	
3	Wastewater Treatment System	1	LS	\$100,500.00	\$189,975.00	\$135,000.00	
4	Building	1	LS	\$42,500.00	\$35,385.00	\$40,000.00	
5	Electrical	1	LS	\$49,010.00	\$60,420.00	\$27,500.00	
	Total Division II Base Bid			\$426,945.00	\$395,272.00	\$287,800.00	\$0.00
	Combined Division Bid Deduct	1	LS	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$10,000.00	
	Additive Bid Item #1 McAirloid's Water Connection	1	LS	\$31,500.00	\$30,530.00	\$28,000.00	
	Additive Bid Item #2 Well #6 Development	1	LS	\$89,750.00	\$28,030.00	\$52,500.00	
	TOTAL BIDS						

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Board authorize the County Administrator to enter into contracts with Falwell Corporation and Steve Martin Trenching. The Finance department has advised that the remaining balance of \$230,580.00 is available from the utility budget after receipt of the DHCD grant amount of \$700,000.00.

NOTE: The County Administrator must first sign a contract with the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) prior to signing contracts with contractors. (RESOLUTION #18-03-2007)

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors to award the bid to Falwell Corporation and Steve Martin Trenching and to authorize the County Administrator to execute the necessary documents.

MOTION BY: Charles Wagner
SECONDED BY: Charles Poindexter
VOTING ON THE MOTION WAS AS FOLLOWS:
AYES: Mitchell, Hurt, Poindexter, Wagner, Johnson, Quinn & Angell

Chairman Wayne Angell recessed the meeting for the previously advertised public hearings as follows:

PETITION of Geoffrey B. Hardaway, Hardstone Development, LLC, as Petitioner: Owner Merriman L. Brooks and Amanda C. Brooks; Elton Cundiff Bulldozing & Farms, Inc., to rezone property currently zoned A-1, Agricultural District to B-2 Business District General to develop the site for use as a stand alone Dollar General Retail Store. The

future land use map of the current adopted Comprehensive Plan designates this area of State Route 40 East as Rural Residential. The property is located on State Route 40 East, Old Franklin Turnpike, 3/10 of a mile past Simmons Creek Road (State Route 673) in the Union Hall Magisterial District of Franklin County and is identified on Franklin County Real Estate Tax Records as Tax Map # 65, Parcel # 63.3; a portion of Tax Map # 65, Parcel # 63.2. (Case # R 07-01-01); (Case # R 07-01-01; revised R 07-03-02)

Staff advised the Board they had received a letter from Hardstone Development, LLC, requesting to withdraw for any further consideration by the Board of Supervisors.

PETITION of Buddy D. Mason, as Petitioner and Owner, to rezone ± 2.520 acres of property currently zoned A-1, Agricultural District to B-1, Business District Limited, with possible proffered conditions, in order to rent properties for small businesses for commercial use. Both properties have existing structures currently being used as rental office space. The future land use map of the current adopted Comprehensive Plan designates this area of State Route 616, Morewood Road, as a Rural Village Center Corridor and does not set forth a density range. The property is located in the Westlake Village Overlay District on State Route 616, Morewood Road, in the Gills Creek Magisterial District of Franklin County and is identified on Franklin County Real Estate Tax Records as Tax Map # 30, Parcel #'s 7 and 8. (Case # R 07-01-04; revised R 07-03-01)

James Gilbert, IV, Attorney, presented the petitioner's request.

No one spoke for or against the proposed rezone.

(RESOLUTION #19-03-2007)

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors to approve the aforementioned rezoning with proffers and the proposed rezoning will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property, that the character of the projected future land use of the community will not be adversely impacted, that such use will be in harmony with the purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance and with the public health, safety and general welfare, will promote good zoning practice and is in accord with Section 25-730 of the Franklin County Code and Section 15.2-2283, Purpose of zoning ordinances of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended with proffers as follows:

1. The two (2) structures on the two (2) adjoining parcels shall share one (1) entrance which is to be shown on the applicant's site plan. At such time as applicant removes the residential type structures now located on the property, the applicant will be required to obtain a commercial entrance permit from VDOT (Virginia Department of Transportation).
2. Parking shall be provided in the rear of both structures now existing on Tax Parcels # 30-7 and # 30-8.
3. Signage on fences shall be prohibited.
4. Until such time as the presently existing structures located on Tax Parcels # 30-7 and # 30-8 are removed or relocated, signage shall be limited to one (1) thirty-two (32) square foot monument style sign.
5. No additional outdoor lighting shall be allowed except as shown on an approved site plan based on future development of the property. Any parking lot lights will be directional, shielded lighting. No additional lighting shall be installed on the presently existing structures.
6. Until such time as the presently existing structures located on Tax Parcels # 30-7 and # 30-8 are removed or replaced, and a site plan for future development is approved, no outdoor displays of products or related products and/or services shall be allowed. Temporary outdoor storage containers shall be prohibited.
7. Applicant, or his successor in interest, shall cause future structures built on the Tax Parcels # 30-7 and # 30-8 to be served by the county public water system if access to said water system is available to said parcels along the boundary of the property adjoining Moorwood Road.
8. Applicant will submit a site plan within sixty (60) days following approval of the rezoning by the Board of Supervisors.

MOTION BY: Russ Johnson

SECONDED BY: Hubert Quinn

VOTING ON THE MOTION WAS AS FOLLOWS:

AYES: Mitchell, Hurt, Poindexter, Wagner, Johnson, Quinn & Angell

PETITION of Duane H. Davis as Petitioner; Margaret C. Thurman, William Shirley Campbell, Dalphia Campbell Furrow and Linda Campbell Waybright as Owners, for a Special Use

Permit, with possible conditions, for property currently zoned A-1, Agricultural District, for the purpose of a mini- storage facility with 276 units of varying sizes with outside storage of boats, trailers and recreational vehicles. The future land use map of the current adopted Comprehensive Plan designates this area of State Route 40 East as Rural Residential. The property is located off State Route 40 East, Old Franklin Turnpike, behind Nichols Store, across from Redwood Post Office consisting of \pm 6.907 acres (per survey) in the Union Hall Magisterial District of Franklin County and is identified on Franklin County Real Estate Tax Records as Tax Map # 54, Parcel # 180. (Case # U 07-03-01)

Clyde Perdue, Attorney, presented the petitioner's request.

Carolyn Furrow, Attorney, representing Elnora Pasley stated her clients concern was the circular driveway for Ms. Pasley's residence. Ms. Furrow was concerned for the safety of her client. The road gets 10,000 vehicles a day which can/will certainly impact her client's safety. Ms. Furrow requested to insure that she have a circular driveway, additional buffer and if VDOT requires an additional turning lane, then the Davis' will have to fix her driveway again.

Raven and Nancy Thurman, own land on the back side of the property. The Thurmans shared concern about the potential water run off; vehicle leakage kept on the property; and what could be done to prohibit chemicals from entering the streams below their home. Mr. Thurman questioned if there are any restrictions on what could be stored in these proposed units. Concerns were further expressed regarding the stormwater detention / retention pond and the facility's hours of operation .. Mr. Thurman stated he would like to protect his property and streams; cattle; and his grandchildren.

Linda Davis, mother of Duane Davis, stated her son was involved in several building projects and felt like her son would not place the community in arms way. Ms. Davis stated she managed storage units on Route 40 West and she has never seen any run off or leakage. She stated the County's growing population currently does not have enough storage units.. Ms. Davis noted the units are neat, quiet and clean and this project is needed in this County.

(RESOLUTION #20-03-2007)

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors to approve the special use permit with the conditions for uses as provided in this chapter with a finding by the Franklin County Board of Supervisors that such use will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property, that the character of the projected future land use of the community will not be adversely impacted, that such use will be in harmony with the purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance and with the public health, safety and general welfare and in accord with the requirements of Section 25-638 of the Franklin County Code and Section 15.2-2283, Purpose of zoning ordinances of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended. Further the proposal encourages economic development activities that provide desirable employment and enlarges the tax base.

1. The property shall be developed in general conformance with the concept plan prepared by Stone Engineering dated January 1, 2007, revised March 27, 2007, provided that the area designated in "the front" of the property, south of the storage units, providing for the location of the "boat/trailer and RV storage" may be relocated entirely to the rear and the buildings may be reconfigured to work with the contour of the land.
2. The proposed easement providing vehicular access to the project site shall be thirty (30) feet in width, twenty (20) feet of which shall be paved (minimum construction to consist of gravel base with surface treatment).
3. (a) Any off-premises sign located on the adjoining tax parcel (# 54-179) shall not exceed thirty-two (32) square feet, per side, in area and eight (8) feet in height. Property owner approval for any sign located on the said adjoining parcel (# 54-179) shall be required upon submission of a sign permit. (b) Wall signage for identification of each storage building shall be limited to two (2) square feet for each identifying sign located on a building with no building having more than two (2) signs per front and rear and one (1) per side. Each storage unit will be identified by number or letter by such identification (sign) no larger than one (1) square foot.
4. Yard sale type of activities and/or the selling of stored items and/or retail activities on site shall be prohibited. This shall not prohibit the lawful sale of unit contents in the event of foreclosure or similar event.
5. Outdoor storage shall be limited to properly licensed boats, trailers, and RV's. Storage location shall not exceed side setbacks of proposed self-storage buildings and not interfere with designated parking and loading areas. Outdoor storage shall be single-story only.
6. In order to maintain existing vegetation and minimize the industrial appearance of the project, the applicant should preserve, if possible, the existing large hardwood trees located within the proposed thirty foot (30') wide easement. The property owner shall

maintain the health and vitality of the existing twenty foot (20') wide perimeter buffer and replace if damaged or diseased. The buffer along the property line with the Brooks' property (tax map/parcel # 54-182), for a length of 165 feet, shall be forty (40) feet wide, consisting of the natural tree line buffer for thirty (30) feet then a ten (10) foot wide buffer consisting of a single row of Leyland Cypress trees planted six (6) feet apart with each tree being six (6) feet in height at the time of planting, and then the fence line.

7. All lighting shall be arranged and installed so that direct or reflective illumination does not exceed 0.5 foot-candles above background levels, measured at the landscape buffer. Fixtures shall be shielded and directed downward.
8. The height of the proposed self-storage units shall be one (1) story and no greater than twenty (20) feet from the established grade. Any shelter for the outdoor storage shall not exceed twenty (20) feet from established grade.
9. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the proposed thirty (30) foot wide easement shall be recorded with the County.
10. Hours of operation shall be from 6:00 am to 12:00 am. The major repair or servicing of vehicles on site shall be prohibited. No changing of fluids shall be allowed on site. Any vehicle leaking any fluids shall be removed from the site immediately or measures taken to prevent any leakage from entering the topsoil. The owner of this development shall ensure compliance with this condition. The owner shall inspect all vehicles, boats and RV's, etc. stored outside daily. Owner of the storage facility, or designee, shall inspect the sewage tanks on any boat or RV to insure they contain no sewage prior to allowing the same to originally be stored on site. An agent of the County shall be allowed access to the site, as necessary, to ensure compliance with conditions.
11. Roofs, walls, and doors of the storage buildings will be of matching or complementing colors, with an earth tone color.
12. The site shall meet Virginia Stormwater Management Program (VSMP) regulations including preparation of a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPP) to address stormwater quality.
13. The fence shown on the interior of the natural buffer shall be no closed than fifty (50) feet to the Brooks' property well at any point.
14. Stormwater management shall consist of a minimum of two (2) ponds located near the rear property line, near the northeast and northwest corners.
15. Rental agreement shall specify no flammable liquids, pesticides, herbicides, or other hazardous substances shall be stored in any unit. Informational signage shall be installed on fencing and/or units to inform tenants and shall not exceed four (4) square feet in size.

MOTION BY: Charles Poindexter

SECONDED BY: Charles Wagner

VOTING ON THE MOTION WAS AS FOLLOWS:

AYES: Mitchell, Hurt, Poindexter, Wagner, Johnson, Quinn & Angell

PUBLIC NOTICE

The Franklin County Board of Supervisors will hold a public hearing at approximately **6:00 P.M., on Tuesday, March 27th, 2007**, in the Meeting Room located in the Courthouse, Rocky Mount, Virginia to consider proposed amendments to County Code Chapter 4 to include a proposed Coyote Bounty as follows:

§4-68.1 Killing of Coyotes.

It shall be lawful for any person to kill coyotes within the boundaries of Franklin County on private property provided that one of the following exists as to the property on which any such coyote is killed:

- (i) such person owns the property, and
- (ii) such person is the lawful tenant in possession of the property, and
- (iii) such person has the written permission of the owner or lawful tenant in possession of the property to kill such coyote, and
- (iv) the person is not hunting on Sunday.

§ 4-68.2. Payment of Bounty for Coyotes.

A. Upon satisfaction of the criteria set forth in subsection B below, and subject to the annual limitation specified in subsection D below, a bounty shall be paid by the county for each coyote killed within the boundaries of Franklin County, as provided herein, in the following amount:

1. \$25.00, for a carcass presented to the animal control officer.

- B. In order to qualify for a bounty, any person who kills a coyote shall present to the animal control officer or his designee:
1. the carcass of the coyote;
 2. evidence of the identity of such person, including photo identification;
 3. an application in a form furnished by the animal control officer and executed by such person that:
 - a. states the name, street address and mailing address of such person;
 - b. identifies the date on which such coyote was killed, the property on which such coyote was killed and the approximate distance of such property from the closest agricultural use within the boundaries of Franklin County; and
 - c. as to the property on which such coyote was killed, states whether
 - (i) such person owns the property,
 - (ii) such person is the lawful tenant in possession of the property,
 - (iii) such person has the written permission of the owner or lawful tenant in possession of the property to kill such coyote, in which event the affidavit shall also be executed by the owner or lawful tenant in possession of the property, and
 - (iv) such coyote was not killed between midnight Saturday and midnight Sunday.
- C. Upon satisfaction of the criteria set forth in subsection (B) above, the animal control officer or his designee shall clip the tongue of such coyote and present the claim for approval. Any person who makes a claim under this section shall be responsible for the lawful disposal of the carcass of the coyote.
- D. The total dollar amount of bounties to be paid under this article shall not exceed the sum of \$2,500.00 within a fiscal year; provided, however, such limit may be increased in a given year by duly adopted resolution of the board of supervisors.

§ 4-68.3. Penalty for False Claims.

It shall be unlawful for any person to present a false claim or to receive payment of a bounty on a false claim under this article. Violation of this subsection shall constitute a Class 1 misdemeanor.

1. These ordinances shall become effective July 1, 2007.

Dave Wiseman, Boones Mill Resident, stated for the record the following points:

Coyote Control in Franklin County

Let's do what works

What we know now

- ❑ There are coyotes in Franklin County (no studies available on actual population)
 - ❑ 2006 reported damage to livestock in Franklin County = \$2050
-

What we know now

- ❑ 100+ years of study, research and fieldwork has been done on coyote predation and control
 - ❑ Complete removal of coyotes from a large area is impossible
-

What we know now

- ❑ Coyotes can and do predate upon livestock and domestic pets
 - ❑ In the Eastern U.S. deer make up between 60 and 90 % of the coyote diet
-

What we know now

- Coyote predation to livestock is a serious issue to livestock producers and they do need help, just not a bounty
- It is possible to mitigate the damage done by coyotes

Chad J. Fox
District Supervisor
USDA-APHIS-Wildlife Services
E-mail correspondence

Bounties Do Not Work

- From 1935 to 1970 Michigan paid \$1,899,280 for 11,569 coyotes. After 35 years of continuous bounties on coyotes, only 5 fewer were killed in 1970 (3,021) than in 1935 (3,026).

- \$164 per coyote (in pre-1970 dollars)

Chad J. Fox
District Supervisor
USDA-APHIS-Wildlife Services
E-mail correspondence

The Two Approaches to the Issue

- Emotional reaction
 - Fear
 - Anger
 - Desire for immediate action
 - Practical problem-solving
 - Study situation
 - Devise solution
 - Implement solution
-

Specific Local Issues

- ☐ How much will the proposed program cost?
 - The bounty money itself
 - Administrative costs
 - ☐ Where will the money come from?
 - ☐ Who would administer the program?
 - Training costs?
 - Additional salary?
 - Time away from regular duties?
-

The state of the science

**USDA ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE
WILDLIFE SERVICES
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

**for the
Management of Coyote, Dog, and Red Fox Predation on
Livestock in the Commonwealth
of Virginia.**

Prepared by:
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE
WILDLIFE SERVICES
In Conjunction With:
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries
Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
April 2002

Bounties are not supported by (USDA) Wildlife Services because:

- ☐ Bounties are not effective in reducing damage.

Bounties are not supported by (USDA) Wildlife Services because:

- Circumstances surrounding take of animals is largely unregulated.
 - A financial incentive increases the likelihood that illegal, unethical, and dangerous methods may be used to harvest animals for bounty

USDA, APHIS, WS
EA MANAGEMENT OF COYOTE, DOG, AND RED FOX PREDATION ON LIVESTOCK IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
2002

Bounties are not supported by (USDA) Wildlife Services because:

- No process exists to prohibit taking of animals from outside the damage management area for compensation purposes.
 - There is no way of really verifying that the animals being turned in for bounty money actually came from Franklin County

USDA, APHIS, WS
EA MANAGEMENT OF COYOTE, DOG, AND RED FOX PREDATION ON LIVESTOCK IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
2002

Bounties are not supported by (USDA) Wildlife Services because:

- Bounty hunters may mistakes dogs and foxes as coyotes.
- Official responsible for checking in coyotes may mistake dogs and foxes as coyotes.
- Coyote bounties have a long history (>100 years in the U.S.) of use in many states without ever achieving the intended results of reducing damage and population levels (Parker 1995).

USDA, APHIS, WS
EA MANAGEMENT OF COYOTE, DOG, AND RED FOX PREDATION ON LIVESTOCK IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA 2002

Bounties are not supported by (USDA) Wildlife Services because

The overwhelming disadvantage of coyote bounties is the misdirection of funds meant to, but not effectively and economically able to, reduce coyote damage to livestock.

USDA, APHIS, WS
EA MANAGEMENT OF COYOTE, DOG, AND RED FOX PREDATION ON LIVESTOCK IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
2002

The Case of Augusta County

- In 2006 they took **256** coyotes. The VDGIF and WS figure there are between 1000 and 1500 coyotes in that County alone.
 - 256 is around 20% of the coyotes.
 - You would need to remove over 70% for several years in a row to begin reducing the population, (not to mention having the same results from all surrounding counties).

Chad Fox
District Supervisor
USDA-APHIS-Wildlife Services
E-mail correspondence

The Case of Augusta County

- They are paying for:
 - compensatory coyotes, i.e. coyotes that would die anyway,
 - coyotes were brought in from other counties.
 - out of that 256, how many were from other areas,....other states,..... road kill,..... killed by deer or turkey hunters who would never pass up a shot at a coyote? We don't know

Chad Fox
District Supervisor
USDA-APHIS-Wildlife Services
E-mail correspondence

The Case of Augusta County

- ❑ **WS is already working the high risk farms in that County**
 - worked over 43 Augusta County farms in 2006 and many WS-captured coyotes were turned in by farmers to spite the bounty, by farm hands wanting to supplement their income, or stolen by others and turned in.
 - WS estimated over 20 coyotes were taken from WS traps
 - ❑ coyotes that would have died anyway
 - **Bounties bring out the bad in some people and there is nothing to stop that.**

Chad Fox
District Supervisor
USDA-APHIS-Wildlife Services
E-mail correspondence

The Case of Augusta County

- ❑ In 2004 (pre bounty), the VDGIF says that 229 coyotes were killed by hunters in Augusta County. In effect, the 2006 coyote bounty costing \$16,425, paid for an additional 27 coyotes
 - That's \$608 per coyote

Chad Fox
District Supervisor
USDA-APHIS-Wildlife Services
E-mail correspondence

Utah's state-wide bounty program

- Based on county records, a total of 1,035 coyotes were harvested during the program in 2000, probably less than 1% of the coyotes in participating counties.
- ❑ this is far below the level necessary to reduce coyote abundance for even one year.
 - ❑ While Utah's coyote bounty may provide an enhanced, subsidized recreation program for a small segment of Utah citizens, it is **unlikely to have any beneficial effect on populations of livestock or big game.**

Effects of Utah's coyote bounty program on harvester behavior
Rebecca A. Bartel and Mark W. Brunson
Wildlife Society Bulletin 2003, 31(3):

Giles County: a smaller example

- ❑ Giles County enacted the Coyote Bounty in November, 2000.
- ❑ The bounty was placed at \$50 for each animal and budgeted funds not to exceed \$2,500 annually, Board is able to appropriate additional funds at their discretion
- ❑ The first year (Nov. – June, 2001) the funds were expended very quickly and the board approved an extra amount (I think it was \$500) to complete the fiscal year.
- ❑ In August, 2003, the bounty amount was lowered to \$25 per coyote. **Funds have been fully expended each year.**

Susan A. Kidd
Giles County Administration
E-mail correspondence

Will bounties lead to more hunting?

- ❑ Looking at Utah's statewide program
- ❑ The program did not produce the desired results, in terms of either increasing hunter participation or reducing coyote populations.

Effects of Utah's coyote bounty program on harvester behavior
Rebecca A. Bartel and Mark W. Brunson
Wildlife Society Bulletin 2003, 31(3):

What does work

- ❑ Virginia Cooperative Coyote Damage Control Program (VCCDCP) has been used as a model that other states have copied and are trying to copy
-

What Does work

- ☐ Integrated Predator Management
 - Improved husbandry practices
 - Predator resistant fencing
 - Frightening devices
 - Guardian animals
 - **Predator removal (killing them)**
-

What does work

- ☐ Integrated Predator Management
 - Cost/benefit analysis
 - ☐ 4-1 ratio
 - ☐ **For every dollar spent on IMP, four dollars in economic savings is realized**
-

If Franklin County is serious about dealing with coyotes...

- ☐ Let's implement a program of controls that works.
- ☐ Let us NOT do the one thing that has proven time and again not to work.

Paul Ferguson stated he was indeed in favor of the bounty and wished the Board would raise the proposed bounty to \$100 for a bounty rather than the advertised \$25.00.

Mary Ann Ellis opposed the coyotes bounty and feels like it is a waste of tax payers money and it is a waste of funds.

(RESOLUTION #21-03-2007)

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors to not adopt the Coyote Bounty as advertised.

MOTION BY: David Hurt
 SECONDED BY: Russ Johnson
 VOTING ON THE MOTION WAS AS FOLLOWS:
 AYES: Hurt, Poindexter, & Johnson
 NAYS: Mitchell, Wagner, Quinn & Angell

THE MOTION FAILS WITH A 3-4 VOTE.

(RESOLUTION #22-03-2007)

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors to adopt the Coyote Bounty as advertised.

MOTION BY: Leland Mitchell
 SECONDED BY: Charles Wagner
 VOTING ON THE MOTION WAS AS FOLLOWS:
 AYES: Mitchell, Wagner, Quinn & Angell
 NAYS: Hurt, Poindexter, & Johnson

THE MOTION PASSED WITH A 4-3 VOTE.

PUBLIC HEARING

In accordance to Section 33.1-70.01 of the Code of Virginia, Franklin County Board of Supervisors and the Virginia Department of Transportation have jointly formulated a budget for the expenditure of improvement funds for the next fiscal year as well as to update the current Six-Year Secondary Roads Improvement Program based on projected allocation of funding.

In accordance with this section of the Code of Virginia, the Franklin County Board of Supervisors has established a time of **6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 27th, 2007**, in the Board of Supervisors Meeting Room in the Franklin County Courthouse to allow for public comment. Copies of the proposed Six-Year Plan and priority listing for the upcoming fiscal year are available for review in (1) the Office of the Contract Administrator, Virginia Department of Transportation, Rocky Mount Office at 649 State Street, Rocky Mount and (2) the Office of Finance at 70 East Court Street, Suite 301, Rocky Mount, Virginia.

Tony Handy, Residency Administrator, presented the proposed 6-Year Secondary Road Plan.

No one spoke for or against the proposed plan.

(RESOLUTION #23-03-2007)

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors to approve the proposed 6-Year Secondary Road Plan as advertised.

MOTION BY: Russ Johnson
 SECONDED BY: Leland Mitchell
 VOTING ON THE MOTION WAS AS FOLLOWS:
 AYES: Mitchell, Hurt, Poindexter, Wagner, Johnson, Quinn & Angell

PETITION of the Franklin County Board of Supervisors to amend Chapter 25 of the Franklin County Zoning Ordinance, Article V, Division 3, Special Use Permits, Sections 25-641, Expirations of special use permits and 25-643, Revocation.

Sec. 25-641. Expiration of special use permits.

Special use permits shall expire in eighteen (18) months if no commencement of use, structure or activity has taken place. In the event that the use, structure or activity for which any such permit is issued shall not be commenced within eighteen (18) months after the issuance of such permit, the same shall be deemed abandoned and the authority granted thereunder shall thereupon terminate. For purposes of this chapter, the term "commenced" shall be construed to include the extensive obligations or substantial expenditures in relation to the project such as engineering or architectural designs, land clearing associated with the

project, and construction of any structure necessary to the use of such permit within eighteen (18) months from the date of the issuance. See section 25-643, "Revocation."

Sec. 25-643. Revocation.

Any permit issued pursuant to this chapter may be revoked by the ~~zoning administrator~~ Board of Supervisors, after notice and hearing pursuant to section ~~45.1-434~~ 15.2-2204 of the Code of Virginia, for willful noncompliance with this chapter or any conditions imposed under the authority of this chapter. ~~In the event that the use, structure or activity for which any such permit is issued shall not be commenced within eighteen (18) months after the issuance of such permit, the same shall be deemed abandoned and the authority granted thereunder shall thereupon terminate. For purposes of this chapter, the term "commenced" shall be construed to include the commencement of construction of any structure necessary to the use of such permit within eighteen (18) months from the date of the issuance thereof which is thereafter completed within one (1) year; provided, that the board of supervisors may, as a condition of approval, impose such alternative time limits as may be reasonable in a particular case.~~

No one spoke for or against the proposed amendment to the aforementioned Chapter 25-641 &643.

(RESOLUTION #24-03-2007)

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors to approve as advertised.

MOTION BY: Charles Poindexter
SECONDED BY: Charles Wagner
VOTING ON THE MOTION WAS AS FOLLOWS:
AYES: Mitchell, Hurt, Poindexter, Wagner, Johnson, Quinn & Angell

PETITION of the Franklin County Board of Supervisors to amend Chapter 19 of the Franklin County Subdivision Ordinance, Article II, Section 19-26, Plat review fee and Article III, Division 5, Streets, Sections 19-109, Construction and design requirements for streets, 19-115, Private streets, and 19-177, Required statements.

SEC. 19-26. PLAT REVIEW FEE.

There shall be a charge for the examination and approval or disapproval of every final plat reviewed by the agent in accordance with the fees as adopted in Chapter 27, Land Use Development, of the Franklin County Code. ~~Prior to recordation of the plat, the subdivider shall deposit with the agent checks payable to the county treasurer in the amount: The fee is payable at the time of submission of the subdivision plat for review.~~

-\$10.00- -	Exemption of subdivision ordinance Family Adjoining owner 150-foot road frontage on primary roads; 125-foot road frontage on secondary roads/35,000 sq. ft. (2 lots or less)
\$50.00	\$5.00/lot large subdivisions (less than 5 lots with state front road frontage) 150-foot road frontage on primary roads; 125-foot frontage on secondary roads/35,000 sq. ft. (3 to 9 lots)
\$100.00- -	\$5.00/lot large subdivisions or any subdivision which requires construction of a new road 150-foot road frontage on primary roads; 125-foot road/35,000 sq. ft. (10 lots or more)

(Ord. of 11-28-79, § 16-12; Ord. of 7-27-81, § D; Rev. of 4-17-89; Res. No. 30-05-91, 5-22-91; Res. No. 24-06-91, 6-18-91)

Cross references: Section 27-1, Fee Schedule.

State law references: Authority for above fee, Code of Virginia, § 15.1-466(i).

19-109 CONSTRUCTION AND DESIGN REQUIREMENTS FOR STREETS.

(a) Subdivision streets shall be constructed and plans submitted in accordance with the current Virginia Department of Transportation subdivision street requirements when new streets are created to serve the lots, tracts or parcels in the subdivision.

(b) ~~The streets in the subdivision that are not in the Virginia Department of Transportation system will not be maintained or improved by the Virginia Department of Transportation or the county. Any and all streets that are not included in the system of state highways will be privately maintained and will not be eligible for acceptance into the system of state highways unless improved to current Department of Transportation standards with funds other than those appropriated by Franklin County or the General Assembly and allocated by the Commonwealth Transportation Board.~~

19-115 PRIVATE STREETS.

(a) ~~There shall be no streets not constructed to state standards platted in any subdivision. All streets platted in any subdivision shall be constructed to state standards.~~

(b) Any and all streets that are not included in the system of state highways will be privately maintained and will not be eligible for acceptance into the system of state highways unless improved to current Department of Transportation standards with funds other than those appropriated by Franklin County or the General Assembly and allocated by the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

(c) Any subdivision plat depicting lots accessed by private roads shall have the following statement written thereon prior to recordation in the Franklin County Circuit Court Clerk's Office:

"The streets in the subdivision hereon depicted do not meet the standards necessary for inclusion in the system of state highways and will not be maintained by the Virginia Department of Transportation or Franklin County and are not eligible for rural addition funds or any other funds appropriated by the General Assembly and allocated by the Commonwealth Transportation Board."

19-177 REQUIRED STATEMENTS.

(a) Any subdivision plat depicting large lots accessed by private roads which will not be constructed to meet the standards necessary for inclusion in the secondary system of state highways shall have the following statement written thereon prior to recordation in the Franklin County Circuit Court Clerk's Office:

"The private roads in the large lot subdivision hereon depicted do not meet state standards, are not intended for inclusion in the system of state highways, and will not be maintained by the Virginia Department of Transportation nor the County of Franklin and are not eligible for rural addition funds or any other funds appropriated by the General Assembly and allocated by the Commonwealth Transportation Board. The maintenance of the private roads shown hereon shall be the mutual responsibility of the landowners whose lots are served by said private roads. The County of Franklin encourages participation in the private road maintenance agreement to be recorded in conjunction with this large lot subdivision plat but will not participate in any provisions of the maintenance agreement or obligation nor any action to enforce any provisions of the maintenance agreement or obligation."

(b) The grantors in any deed of conveyance of any subdivision lot to which the above statement applies shall contain the following statement in such deed:

"The private roads in the large lot subdivision hereon depicted do not meet state standards, are not intended for inclusion in the system of state highways, and will not be maintained by the Virginia Department of Transportation nor the County of Franklin and are not eligible for rural addition funds or any other funds appropriated by the General Assembly and allocated by the Commonwealth Transportation Board. The maintenance of the private roads shown hereon shall be the mutual responsibility of the landowners whose lots are served by said private roads. The County of Franklin encourages participation in the private road maintenance agreement to be recorded in conjunction with this large lot subdivision plat but will not participate in any provisions of the maintenance agreement or obligation nor any action to enforce any provisions of the maintenance agreement or obligation."

(RESOLUTION #25-03-2007)

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors to approve the proposed amendments as advertised for Chapter 19-26: 19-109; 19-115; & 19-177.

MOTION BY: Charles Poindexter

SECONDED BY: Russ Johnson

VOTING ON THE MOTION WAS AS FOLLOWS:

AYES: Mitchell, Hurt, Poindexter, Wagner, Johnson, Quinn & Angell

CLOSED MEETING

(RESOLUTION #26-03-2007)

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors to into a closed meeting in accordance with 2.2-3711, a-30, Discussion of the award of a public contract involving the expenditure of public funds, including interviews of bidders or offerors, and discussion of the terms or scope of such contract, where discussion in an open session would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body, of the Code of Virginia, as Amended, of the Code of Virginia, as amended.

MOTION BY: Hubert Quinn

SECONDED BY: Russ Johnson

VOTING ON THE MOTION WAS AS FOLLOWS:

AYES: Mitchell, Hurt, Poindexter, Wagner, Johnson, Quinn & Angell

MOTION: Leland Mitchell

SECOND: David Hurt

RESOLUTION: #27-03-2007

MEETING DATE March 27th, 2007

WHEREAS, the Franklin County Board of Supervisors has convened an closed meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of The Virginia Freedom of Information Act: and

WHEREAS, Section 2.2-3712(d) of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by this Franklin County Board of Supervisors that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Franklin County Board of Supervisors hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge, (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed or considered by the Franklin County Board of Supervisors.

VOTE:

AYES: Mitchell, Hurt, Poindexter, Wagner, Johnson, Quinn, & Angell

NAYS: NONE

ABSENT DURING VOTE: NONE

ABSENT DURING MEETING: NONE

Chairman Angell recessed the meeting.

W. WAYNE ANGELL
CHAIRMAN

RICHARD E. HUFF, II
COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR